Tobit

Loren Stuckenbruck and Stuart Weeks

Introduction

The Greek witnesses for Tobit reflect three different versions of the book in Greek, and this chapter is therefore divided appropriately. In the initial section, matters which apply to the book as a whole and to the original translation will be presented. Matters pertaining to each of the versions individually will be examined separately afterwards.

The inter-relationship of the textual witnesses is extremely complicated. Five fragmentary manuscripts of the book from Qumran have been published, four in Aramaic (4Q196–199), and one in Hebrew (4Q200); some additional material, initially thought to be from 4Q196 and published as such, is now believed to represent a fifth Aramaic manuscript (4Q196a). Although there are some minor differences between them where they overlap, these all attest what is essentially a single version of the book. That version is close to the version which seems to have underpinned the very diverse and unstable Old Latin tradition, which implies that the Latin texts were translated from a Greek text similar in content to the Qumran manuscripts. No such Greek text was known to scholarship, however, before Tischendorf's publication of Codex Sinaiticus in the nineteenth century. The great majority of Greek manuscripts instead reflect a somewhat different version, which has become the standard Septuagint text of Tobit, but which appears to be a secondary revision of the original Greek translation (known as GI, or the 'Short' text). A small number of late manuscripts, which belong to this version for much of their length, reflect a separate, independent revision between about 6.8 and 13.2. This also underlies the majority Syriac text from 7.11. This revision is known as the 'Third Greek' version, or GIII. Only two Greek witnesses, in fact, contain a text which has been subjected to neither of these revisions: Sinaiticus and the eleventh-century Βατοπαιδιος 513 from Mount Athos (MS 319 in the standard system). The latter, however, has an 'unrevised' text only in 3.6–6.16, and although Sinaiticus presents such a text throughout Tobit, it is marred by many serious scribal errors and omissions. This version is known as the 'Long' text, or GII. Further or intermediate Greek versions of the book may also have existed, as it is difficult to align several early papyrus fragments precisely with one or other of the known versions.

Comparison with the Old Latin texts is far from straightforward, since these present many problems of their own, but it is clear that they often reflect a source text which differs from Sinaiticus but are sometimes probably more original than Sinaiticus. Readings from them are sometimes preserved in the other Greek versions. Sinaiticus and MS 319 do not have, therefore, a monopoly on early readings, and do not simply present us with the original Greek translation; if the text of GII has not been so extensively revised as that of the GI and GIII versions, it is not wholly free of revisions. This fact is also apparent from comparison with the Qumran texts. Although it is important to be clear that the source-text used by the Greek translator was not wholly identical to any of these, occasional agreements between the Qumran manuscripts and GI or GIII against GII point again to the probability that GII has the later reading. In short, then, GII is generally closest to the single, original translation which lies behind all the Greek versions, but we have no witness to that translation which is wholly or largely free of revisions or significant errors. This makes it hard to establish the original text in very many places without resorting to investigation of all the witnesses, and correspondingly difficult to address general matters of translation technique or style. On the other hand, the book does offer unusual opportunities for the study of development and revision within a Greek textual tradition.

Editions

The principal editions of GI and GII are:

Brooke-McLean (III.I, 1940). The text of Tobit is on pp. 85–110 (B), and 111–122 (S).

Rahlfs; Göttingen (ed. R. Hanhart, *VIII, 5*, 1983)

Key texts (including manuscripts of GIII and the Old Latin) are presented synoptically in Wagner, Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse; and Weeks, et al., The Book of Tobit.

The principal Qumran texts are published in: Fitzmyer, 'Tobit', (DJD 19), pp. 1–76, pls. I–X. The further fragment presented in Elgvin and M. Hallermayer, 'Schøyen Ms. 5234' as from 4Q196, will be re-edited by Elgvin and E. Eshel in a forthcoming volume, and identified as a witness to a new manuscript, 4Q196a, from which additional unpublished material may have been preserved.

1. General Characteristics

Tobit was certainly translated into Greek from a Semitic language, and from a text which was close to the version attested in 4Q196–200. Despite occasional suggestions to the contrary, there is no good reason to suppose that it was translated more than once, or that any of our ancient witnesses has been revised against a Semitic text. If a quite different Aramaic version existed and formed the basis of the Vulgate version, then it has probably not influenced the Greek tradition; Jerome's claim to have used an Aramaic text, must, in any case, be viewed in the light of the pervasive Old Latin influence on his translation, and his inclination to inject language or ideas which are clearly his own.

The character of the original Tobit does not necessitate a date for its composition at, or close to the seventh century B.C.E., the time at which the story is set. Indeed, the ease with which the text readily appeals both to 'the law' or 'book of Moses' and to individual prophets, suggests a time at least after the composition of Chronicles (see 2 Chr. 23.18)—so probably no earlier than the latter part of the fourth century B.C.E. On the other hand, the composition must be assigned to a time before the palaeographical dating of the Dead Sea manuscripts (100 B.C.E. to 25 C.E.). Since Tobit's *post eventum* prediction of events (14.3-7) makes no mention of the turbulence in Jerusalem and persecution of the Jews before and during the Maccabean war (14.5), the book was probably composed before 175 B.C.E. Most scholars thus date the book to between the late fourth to the early second century B.C.E., while some more narrowly specify a range of 225 to 175 B.C.E. It would not be surprising to find Jewish compositions in either Hebrew or Aramaic during that period, and since the middle of the nineteenth century, the question of original language has been discussed in relation to several issues. First, there are references to Tobit among patristic authors. While Origen maintained that the Jews do not have the books of Judith and Tobit 'among the apocrypha in Hebrew' (*Ep. ad Africanum* 19), Jerome claimed that the book was written 'in Chaldee' (Aramaic; see *Ep. ad Chromatium*). While pointing in the direction of Aramaic, these statements do no more than to suggest that Tobit was circulating in Aramaic during the early centuries of the Common Era. Second, as noted above, the Dead Sea Scrolls have yielded five manuscripts preserving Tobit, four in Aramaic and one in Hebrew. While the greater number of extant Aramaic materials does not in itself resolve the question of original language in favour of Aramaic, the several instances of Hebrew influence in those Aramaic texts (including some vocabulary, and the use of four dots to represent the Hebrew divine name at 4Q196 17 i 5 [12.22] and 18.15 [14.2]) points no more clearly in the direction of Hebrew. Likewise, more general considerations do not help. The setting of the story in Nineveh and Rages in the East might suggest Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of that area during the Second Temple period, as the language naturally suited for such a story. On the other hand, the sparseness of concrete evidence for Aramaic texts being translated into Hebrew would favour Hebrew. Recent scholarship has tended slightly to favour Aramaic, but, barring the recovery of further evidence, debates on this can be expected for some time to come.

The Greek translation was not necessarily made from a source-text in the original language of composition, but matters are no more clear-cut here, and much discussion has been devoted to identifying features which might point specifically to Hebrew or Aramaic. This discussion has faced the general problem that we might expect to find both Aramaic influence on Hebrew of this period, and Hebraic, biblicizing features in an Aramaic composition of this sort. There has been little agreement, furthermore, over attempts to identify specific words or phrases as renderings necessarily of either Hebrew or Aramaic originals. The matter is sometimes complicated by difficulties in establishing the original reading of the Greek. The much-discussed relationship between GII πορεύθητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι 'go and rejoice' and 4Q200 שמחי ודוצי, for instance, seems rather irrelevant when the original reading of the Greek is more probably attested by GI χάρητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι 'delight and rejoice' and OL *gaude et laetare*. Again, the argument has not been sufficiently compelling on either side to generate a consensus, and the language of the Greek translator's source-text remains uncertain.

This has consequences, of course, for our evaluation of the translation's character, and the problem is compounded by the fact that we have neither any complete text preserved among the Qumran fragments, nor, indeed, any guarantee that the source text corresponded perfectly, at any given point, to the readings which we do possess. In 3.15, for instance, 4Q196 has 'in all the land of our captivity', but all the Greek and Latin witnesses have 'in the land of my captivity', suggesting that the source text from which they are ultimately derived may have been different. The many errors in our witnesses to GII, and the extensive revisions in GI and GIII also make it difficult to undertake a detailed analysis of translation technique and style in the original translation. However, it is possible to state in general terms that the translation seems to have been an admixture of the literal and the idiomatic, tending strongly toward the former, which is neither exceptional in character, nor particularly close to any other specific Septuagint translation.

2. Time and Place of Composition

The date of the translation is uncertain. Tobit is not certainly cited before the early second century C.E. (when Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* quotes 4.10/12.9), and the earliest manuscript evidence for the Greek is from the third. It is dangerous to place too much weight on orthographic or morphological evidence, especially given the many revisions and errors visible in the tradition, but it is noteworthy that MS 319 attests the forms *μηθενί* and *μεθέν* (=*μηθέν*) at 4.15, which may well be original and probably gave rise to the unexpected sayings about alcohol (*μέθη*) in the GI and OL versions. Sinaiticus lacks the section, but attests *μηθέν* at 14.04 and *οὐθέν* at 12.19. The forms with *theta* in other books were strongly linked to an early date of translation by Thackeray (*Grammar*, pp. 58–62), and are increasingly rare in documentary sources after the second century B.C.E. There is nothing to preclude an early translation, and it should be borne in mind, therefore, that the Qumran witnesses to the Hebrew and Aramaic may post-date the earliest version of the Greek. There is no specific evidence for the place of translation, although it is noteworthy that the vocalization of the Northern Kingdom place-names Kedesh and Hazor as Κυδιώς and Ἀσσήρ in 1.2 is odd, and betrays no familiarity with that region, so Egypt is probably the strongest candidate.

3. Language

It is not possible to recreate the original translation in every detail. It is clear, though, that the translator had a good knowledge of Greek, and sometimes used unusual or technical vocabulary to represent terms in his source. So, for example, we may note the use of *κατ'αλήθειαν* 'after the nature' in 4.12 (GII *ad* MS 319), which is comparable to the usage in Diod. Sic. 4.64.2, of Oedipus enquiring after his birth-parents, or the similar technical usage of ἔγγιστα 'next of kin' in GII 6.12. In 4.20 (*παρεθέμην* 'deposited') and 5.3 (*χειρόγραφον* 'bond'), we find appropriate financial vocabulary, while proper medical terms (such as *λευκώματα* 'white spots') are used throughout where needed to characterize Tobit's blindness and cure. The nature of the translation is such that the style and word-order often feel more Semitic than Greek (see below), but actual 'Semitisms' are uncommon. Accordingly, when we find Greek constructions which were probably selected to match Hebrew/Aramaic constructions in the source text—such as the periphrastic future in GII/GIII 9.4 (where 4Q197 apparently had a clause with להוה + participle), or the partitive use of *ἐκ* in 7.9—the Greek usage may be somewhat unnatural, but the text is not a simple calque.

4. Translation and Composition

On occasion, it seems likely that the translator paraphrased, or rendered according to sense. In 6.8, for instance, GII *οὐ μὴ μείνωσιν* distils the meaning of the expression found in 4Q197 'they will [not] go round their surroundings' (that is, 'they will not hang around them'), and similarly in 3.14, if his source text read literally 'I am clean in my bones' as 4Q196, the translator has omitted the reference to bones. In various places (such as 7.1), the original has apparently been modified to give more Greek forms of greeting. As a general rule, though, the translation seems to have stayed close to the wording and order of its source. The various senses of the _waw_ conjunctive, for example, are only sometimes differentiated, and it is usually rendered with *καί*. Indeed, *δέ* is correspondingly rather unusual in the earliest readings: in GII it appears only at 1.11, 22; 5.2, 4; 7.10; 10.1; and 12.7, and the other versions point to it being a secondary revision in 5.4; 7.10; and 10.1. While it probably is original in 1.22 and 12.7, it corresponds to 4Q196 ארי in the former, and no Qumran text survives for the latter. Where _waw_ has a consecutive sense, it may or may not be rendered by τότε or suchlike, although the original reading of the Greek is not always easy to establish (as at, e.g., the start of 1.22). The general consequence, of course, is that the narrative has a strongly semitic feel. Elsewhere, we find resumptive personal pronouns reproduced awkwardly in the Greek (GII 6.9), non-verbal sentences (GII 6.12), and other features which are not necessarily improper Greek, but which often seem awkward. Many of the revisions in GI and GIII seem to improve the Greek at such points, and it seems possible that those revisions were motivated, at least in part, by a desire for greater clarity and fluency. It would be reasonable to suggest, then, both that the translator was much more concerned to offer a translation that was accurate and faithful than to produce a work which was lucid, stylish, or literary, and that some subsequent readers found the result unsatisfactory.

5. Key Text-critical Issues

The general situation has been outlined above, and is reasonably clear. It is more difficult to establish, however, just how that situation arose. The relatively consistent witness of the manuscripts in the GI tradition, along with the paucity of manuscripts for GII and GIII, gives an impression of three readily separable versions. It is important to observe, however, that a papyrus fragment from the late third century C.E. (Oxyrhynchus 1594 = Cambridge add. 6363) preserves readings in 12.14-19 which correspond at times to the distinctive readings of all three main versions (and sometimes to none). Another, much later papyrus (Oxyrhynchus 1076 = John Rylands Gk.P. 448; ca sixth century) has material from 2.2-5, 8 which frequently differs from GI and GII, and its identification as a fragment of GIII is largely speculative, since that version is not preserved elsewhere for this part of the book. Even the early third-century fragment published recently by Manfredi, which clearly belongs to the GII tradition, has some readings which are unexpected and unique. To whatever extent such variety gave rise to the different versions, or else resulted from their existence and interaction, it seems apparent that the textual situation was once even more complicated than it is now, and perhaps considerably more fluid. Nicklas and Wagner ('Thesen') have accordingly, and with some justice, questioned the value of any simplistic division into separate versions, and of prioritising GII as 'original'. Weeks ('Restoring') has suggested, on the other hand, that correspondences of GI and GIII to the readings of the papyrus fragments and the Old Latin show only that the revisors often took up existing variants from the unrevised tradition, which are sometimes probably more original than the readings found in Sinaiticus; correspondingly, we should neither presume the originality of the unrevised texts, nor automatically exclude the readings of the revised texts as secondary.

6. Ideology and Exegesis

See the discussions under the individual recensions.

7. Reception History

The sustained popularity of the Book of Tobit in medieval Jewish and Christian circles is attested through at least seven different versions that circulated of it in Aramaic (Oxford Bodleian Hebrew MS no. 2339, 14th century) and Hebrew (Cairo Geniza MS no. T-S A 45.26 from Cambridge, 13th century; Constantinople 1516; Constantinople 1519; North French Miscellany from British Library in London, 13th century; notations of a now lost manuscript by Moses Gaster, 19th century; and the *'Otsar Haqqodesh* published in Lemberg in 1851). These versions have not convinced scholars of their text-critical value. However, they remain significant for three primary reasons. First, they reflect the ongoing influence and import of the earlier versions of Tobit, although, because of textual fluidity between the recensions, it is not always possible to be precise about the texts from which they derive. Second, they represent retellings of the storyline which not infrequently reflect the much later Jewish settings in which the story was being told. Third, and related to the previous point, the medieval Jewish texts, insofar as they reflect influence from versions that circulated in Christian circles, may illustrate a process of reclaiming the Book of Tobit. In addition, portions of Tobit made an impact on other literature, such as on the Christian *Testament of Solomon* from the third century C.E. In this case, it is the GII recension that more likely underlies the *Testament*, that is, if the demon Asmodeus' association with Assyria (*T. Sol.* 6.10) reflects the greater prominence of Assyria in GII than in GI (Tob. 1.10, 22; 14.4) and if the mention of the fish's liver and gall together (*T. Sol.* 5.9, 13) reflect the tendency in GII, unlike GI, to regard both of these, together with the heart, as 'medicine' (see below). The Book of Tobit, especially its prayers, also wielded an influence on liturgical texts in Latin (a Mozarabic Breviary, attested in the eleventh century and Gothic Breviary with a liturgy going back to St Isidore both take up the song about Jerusalem from Tobit chapter 13). Finally, a loose retelling of the story also appears in the collection of tales called *Book of Delights*, written by the Barcelona physician Joseph Zabara in the 12th century.

In art, the most well-known paintings taken from scenes in the book were produced by the Italian painters Fra Filippo Lippi (1406–1469) and Raphael (1483–1520) and the Dutch painter Rembrandt (1606–1669). From these painters the most famous works related to the book present the following scenes: Tobit with his wife Anna and her goat (Raphael, ch. 2), Tobias being accompanied by the three archangels (Filippo Lippi, who added the angels Michael and Gabriel to the story of Tobias' journey in ch. 6, with the heavenly Jerusalem, underneath a cross, in the distant background), the healing of Tobit's blindness (Rembrandt, ch. 11), and the ascension of Raphael (Raphael and Rembrandt, ch. 12). Nothing in these paintings can at present be traced to details found specially in one of the other of the Greek recensions, though the Christianisation of the story by Filippo Lippi more likely relates to the Vulgate which contains such traces. Many other artists have since taken up these and other themes from the book. A series of paintings in the Church of the Angel Raphael (14th century) in Venice inspired British author, Sally Vickers, to publish a novel that weaves the narrative of the book with the life of an elderly woman, entitled *Miss Garnet's Angel* (2002). This novel clearly draws on and follows the text of GI.

The Long Version of Tobit (GII)

1. General Characteristics

The original version of Tobit in Greek was largely replaced by the GI version and, to a lesser extent, the GIII version. Both of these were based on texts derived from the initial translation, and preserve readings from that translation. Such texts are now almost extinct: only Codex

Sinaiticus and ms 319 (in 3.6–6.16) preserve texts unaffected by the GI and GIII changes, although they each also embody other alterations to the original, caused by scribal error or deliberate emendation. If Greek witnesses are rare, however, we do have a plethora of Old Latin manuscripts, which present considerable text-critical problems themselves, but which largely reflect a source text also derived ultimately from the initial translation. To the extent that we can recreate that source text, we have, therefore, a third witness to the original tradition. The 'Long Version' of Tobit is a term used, often rather loosely, to characterize these separate witnesses, but some caution and qualification is needed. In the first place, the Greek texts differ from each other and from the Old Latin: although they share an ancestor in the original translation, all probably derive from separate strands in the subsequent transmission of that text, and they do not together represent a particular redaction or recension of the text, as do GI and GIII. We cannot, therefore, set GII in parallel with those others, as if it were the same sort of 'version'. Indeed, if we equate it simply with the original form of the Greek—and it is not uncommon for the translation and even the Qumran manuscripts loosely to be called 'Long' texts—then GI and GIII are simply sub-recensions within GII. For our present purposes, we use the term more specifically with reference to Sinaiticus, MS 319, and the Old Latin texts, and focus on the distinctive characteristics of each.

a. Sinaiticus

For Sinaiticus, the most important of these is probably its defectiveness. The text omits a substantial amount of material, almost certainly as a result of scribal error in most cases. The lengthiest omissions are in 4.7-19 and 13.6-10, but comparison with the other versions suggests some shorter losses too: at the start of the list in 3.12, for instance, the scribe's eye has apparently skipped from one *πάντες οἱ* 'all those' to another, later occurrence: 'Cursed are all those who <reject you, and all who blaspheme you; cursed are all who hate you and all who> speak'. A few verses earlier, in 13.5, *καὶ συνάχει ὑμας* has probably been lost before ἐκ, creating a very confusing sentence. Not all the errors are of omission, however, and so in 11.4, for example, *τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς* 'her son' has apparently been replicated from the end of the next verse (with *καί* then added to facilitate the reading), while in the same verse *κύων* 'dog' has famously and funnily been read as the abbreviation κ(υριο)ς, so that 'the Lord' now follows, instead of 'the dog'. Such errors (and there are many more) are probably not attributable to scribe D of Sinaiticus, who is elsewhere very able, and there are signs that the text had already been altered to overcome the most obvious problems arising from them. Thus in 4.19 Sinaiticus resumes from the lacuna with *δώσει κύριος αὐτοῖς βουλὴν ἀγαθήν* ‘the Lord will; give to them good counsel’, an apparent adaptation to (the now immediately preceding) *οἱ ποιοῦντες ἀλήθιαν* ‘those who act truthfully’ of 4.6, cf. 319 *βουλὴν ἀγαθήν ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος δίδωσιν*. Similarly, in 11.14, *ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς* ‘upon us’ may have been introduced to make sense of the preceding *γένοιτο ὄνομα τὸ μέγα αὐτοῦ* ‘may his great name’ (itself perhaps a corruption), after the blessing of the angels had been accidentally repeated. Sinaiticus has inherited, then, a form of the text which was badly mauled at some earlier stage, and has been further changed in places as a consequence.

Not all of the apparent alterations in the text are attributable to this process, however. We have already noted above that *καί* was apparently replaced by *δέ* in 5.4; 7.10 and 10.1, and this is certainly a stylistic change. From among a number of further instances, we might note also the adoption of the comparative *χρησιμώτερον* ‘more useful’ in 3.10, and the corresponding change of construction which shifts the negation to the subsequent clause; this, too, is almost certainly secondary, and intended to improve the style rather than to alter the sense. Some other changes to content seem motivated by different considerations. In 1.1, for instance, the characters Raphael and Ragouel mysteriously find their way into Tobit’s list of ancestors, while in 5.5 ‘he answered him and’ has probably been deleted as redundant. In the next verse, *ναί πολλάκις ἐγὼ ἐγενόμην ἐκεῖ* ‘yes, I was often there’ seems to be an attempt to make sense of an over-literal *πολλὰ ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι* ‘I know many things’ in the original (cf. 319, OL), while the whole of 4.6 seems to have been switched from a second-person address to an indicative, third-person generalization. It is not always possible to be sure whether the reading of Sinaiticus is original or secondary, but there are many other places in which it appears that the text has been changed for reasons of style, clarity, or the incorporation of specific understandings. If Sinaiticus does not reflect the sort of substantial re-writing which characterizes GI and GIII, it is at least very far from identical to the original Greek translation.

b. MS 319

MS 319 is, of course, defective in a different way, with its ‘Long’ text extending as it does only from 3.6–6.16. In general, this text lies closer to the Old Latin than does that of Sinaiticus. Where they agree, and where precedence can be deduced from other witnesses or from considerations of style and content, they generally preserve a more original text. So, for instance, in 6.12 GIII and the Old Latin both support 319 ἀγαπᾷ αὐτήν ‘he loves her’ against Sinaiticus καλός ‘fair’, and their reading corresponds, furthermore, to that of 4Q197; indeed, it seems likely that the lengthy plus in 319 and the Latin there is also original. Such agreement, accordingly, may be more a matter of deviation from the original in Sinaiticus than of a particular affinity between 319 and the source text of the Latin. There are, indeed, points at which it seems to agree with Sinaiticus against that source text: in 6.6, for instance, the majority Old Latin reading *coeperunt iter agere* ‘they set out on a journey’ seems to suggest a source closer to GI ὥδευον ἀμφότεροι than to the ἐπορεύθησαν of 319 and Sinaiticus. In general, MS 319 should probably be regarded as a more reliable witness to the original Greek translation than is Sinaiticus, but it is not without alterations of its own. In 5.4, for example, where Sinaiticus has apparently changed καὶ to δέ, 319 has τότε, and there are a number of minor errors. Despite the preservation of the ‘Long’ material in a manuscript which otherwise offers a GI text, there is no evidence of systematic revision towards that tradition, and where 319 agrees with GI against Sinaiticus, they often present a discernibly better reading. In 4.5, for instance, both have the singular δικαιοσύνην ‘righteousness’, against the plural of Sinaiticus, and this is supported by OL and the reading of 4Q200. Correspondingly, where Sinaiticus and GI agree against 319, they may highlight errors in 319—as at the end of that same verse, where 319 wrongly has the plural ταῖς ἀδικίαις ‘the offences’.

c. The Old Latin

The pre-Vulgate Latin translations have sometimes been lost almost entirely for other Septuagint works, and are rarely crucial for the reconstruction of the Greek text. For Tobit, the case is very different. Auwers, who is preparing the Beuron edition, lists 16 manuscripts, of which 12 preserve the text in its entirety. In addition to these, there is a fairly substantial body of indirect evidence for certain passages, where the text has been cited or used for liturgical purposes. Furthermore, when Sinaiticus is defective outside the section where we have a Long text in ms 319, the Old Latin provides the only witness to the original translation, generally unaffected by the GI/GIII revisions. More generally, indeed, it often seems to provide a better reading than Sinaiticus, and the Old Latin is, therefore, unusually important for Tobit. This has long been recognized, and it was the Old Latin, after all, which first alerted scholars to the existence of Tobit in a form other than the Short text, before Sinaiticus was even known. It raises, however, many text-critical problems of its own.

The text adopted by Sabatier in his eighteenth-century edition of the Old Latin was based on the ninth-century French Codex Regius 3564 (number 148 in the Beuron scheme, MS Q in Hanhart's edition of the Greek). This is a fair representative of what might be considered the majority Old Latin text (and Gathercole, 'Tobit in Spain', has argued for its priority over and against other related texts), but there is considerable variety within that textual tradition, and two other, very different text-types are known. The first is preserved in the slightly later Spanish Alcalà Bible (Beuron 109; Hanhart ms. X), and is apparently a revision of something like the Regius text. That revision extends beyond Tobit, however, draws on other sources, possibly including Greek texts, and paraphrases so extensively that it is difficult to use for text-critical purposes. It seems, though, to have enjoyed a certain popularity, and to have influenced readings elsewhere in the Old Latin tradition. The other is preserved only for 1.1–6.12, and only in one manuscript, Codex Reginensis 7 (Beuron 143; Hanhart ms. W), which is another ninth-century French product. This differs so very considerably from other Old Latin texts that it may reasonably be supposed to reflect a separate translation, or at least a very intensive revision which drew heavily on Greek sources. In a number of places it supports Sinaiticus against other Old Latin manuscripts, even where they almost certainly have a more original reading (as, for instance, in 3.11, where Sinaiticus and Reginensis alone lack the qualification 'holy and honourable' for God's name, which finds a corresponding reading in 4Q196). It does not do this consistently by any means, but its affinities suggest that it may have been based on a Greek text rather different from the source-text of the majority Old Latin, and it has a great deal in common with the GIII text where the two briefly overlap.

Because it is difficult to say much about the precise character of the sources used, it is also difficult, of course, to assess the nature of the translations. The Latin translators do seem to have adhered fairly closely to the Greek, sometimes adapting to Latin usage or introducing minor facilitations, and more rarely paraphrasing, but generally offering quite a reliable witness to their source text. Their successors, however, often seem to have revised and adapted with considerable freedom, so that the manuscripts themselves vary wildly in content. With much of the material still unpublished, or published inadequately, it is not currently possible to disentangle the complicated relationships between the different Old Latin texts, or to do the comparative work necessary for recreation of the original in many places. Important though they are, then, the Old Latin texts have to be used with much caution for text-critical purposes, and it is unfortunate that Sabatier's text is often presented simplistically as 'the Old Latin', with little appreciation of the underlying problems.

2. Time and Place of Composition

Inasmuch as they transmit readings from the original translation, the 'Long' Greek texts have no particular date or location of their own. The date(s) at which the Old Latin originated cannot be determined with any precision, but a text close to the Regius form used by Sabatier was being cited by Cyprian of Carthage in the middle of the third century, while the Alcalà revision was composed no later than the last quarter of the fourth century, and sections of Tobit from it were cited in the Mediterranean region at the beginning of the fifth. These dates supply *termini ad quem*, and the original translation may have been considerably earlier.

3. Key Text-critical Issues

The discovery of the Tobit manuscripts at Qumran has affirmed the basic priority of the Long Greek tradition, and equivalents to their readings are usually to be found in one or more of the witnesses to that tradition. Reconstruction of the original Greek translation from these sources, however, is far from straightforward in many places. To begin with, there are minor inconsistencies between the Qumran texts where they overlap, and there are also places where Qumran readings correspond to none of the witnesses; in 3.15, for example, we have no equivalent to 4Q196 'in *all* the land'. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that the original Greek translation was based on a text identical to any which we possess, and the Qumran texts cannot properly, therefore, be used to supply or emend the Greek: they are not themselves witnesses to that translation. Of course, where a Qumran reading corresponds to one found in our actual witnesses, the improbability of coincidence lends some presumption of originality to that reading—but that is a rather different matter.

A greater problem arises from our current inability to describe the relationships between the witnesses. Text criticism is not a democratic process: errors may spread far afield, and original readings die out altogether. It is important, therefore, to understand the ways in which witnesses relate to each other and may have inherited readings from each other, but for Tobit such study is still in its infancy. Despite a certain amount of pessimism in some quarters, there is much that can be done here with the evidence already available, and current work on the Old Latin, in particular, promises to furnish better evidence. One aspect of this study, sometimes rather overlooked, is the place of the GI and GIII traditions, which frequently agree with other witnesses against Sinaiticus, and which have a place in the Long tradition family-tree. Too much scholarship on the book still works with an outmoded dichotomy between Long and Short versions, and hands to Sinaiticus an outright victory in the matter of priority, when the situation is actually much more complicated (see Weeks, 'Restoring').

The Short Version of Tobit (GI)

1. General Characteristics

Although it dominates the textual tradition, the Short version of Tobit can no longer be regarded as the basis of the Long, and Deselaers has won little support for his convoluted theory that the Qumran texts are themselves expansions of a lost Short text. The debate over priority goes back many years, and, a quarter of a century ago, Hanhart was still cautious about the question in his edition, but it is now generally accepted that this most common form of Tobit is a re-working of the original translation, which tends to be more concise than the Long texts, and which frequently reads rather more smoothly. Not only is this solution more economical in text-critical terms, but it also avoids the need to explain why GII should have introduced so much material which is apparently redundant.

The distinctiveness of GI should not be exaggerated, however: at the level of individual clauses, and sometimes for quite long passages, the tradition frequently presents a text which is all but indistinguishable from that of Sinaiticus, or differs only in minor ways. Where they do differ substantially, moreover, comparison with the other Long witnesses or the Qumran fragments suggests that it is sometimes Sinaiticus, and not GI, which has imposed changes on the original. As well as offering a version which is of interest in its own right, therefore, GI presents a potentially useful witness to the original translation and to the early development of the textual tradition—even if the extent to which it has been revised in some places mostly limits this usefulness to providing corroboration.

Many of the revisions in GI can be classed as stylistic or clarificatory: they do not change the essential content and meaning of the text. Words are frequently replaced with near synonyms, so that 8.4 uses *συνκλείω* 'to enclose', for example, rather than *ἀποκλείω*, and 13.13 *συνάγω* 'to gather' for *ἐπισυνάγω*, while *δέ*, so rare in GII, is a commonplace of GI. Sentences are sometimes re-written for clarity (e.g., the first sentence of 6.16) or conciseness (e.g., 7.12). Where the alterations are more substantial, they often involve a reduction in detail, and this is especially evident in the presentation of speeches: the characters in GII are usually much less wordy. So in 6.10-13, for example, Raphael manages to put across the essential facts a great deal more succinctly than he does in the Long version, while Tobit's lengthy grumble vanishes altogether from 5.10. Inessential details may be removed as well, so that in 9.5-6, for instance, GII does not recount that Raphael took four servants and two camels with him to visit Gabael, that he told Gabael about the wedding, or that they returned to find Tobias at table; Gabael's enthusiastic speech is then turned into a mere note that he blessed the couple. All this arguably makes the narrative crisper, but the characters more anodyne. It is interesting to observe that such drastic changes do not seem to have been made in the very didactic or theological speeches of 4.5-19 and 12.6-15, or the prayers of 8.5-7, 15-17; 11.14-15 (where Sinaiticus has probably expanded the original), while Tobit's prayer in ch. 13 has only been trimmed, so far as we can tell, at a few particular points. It would seem that GII has rather more interest in this material than in the elaborate details of the storytelling.

2. Time and place of composition

The origins of the GII tradition are unknown, but it already dominates the early manuscript tradition in the fourth century, and seems to be represented in the papyrus fragment which Manfredi published, and dated to the mid-third century. There is no specific reason to suppose that it emerged in Christian rather than Jewish circles, and it could be earlier. Its wide circulation, at least in the East, is indicated by its use as a source-text for the Coptic and Armenian daughter versions, and for most of the Syriac (see on GIII, below).

3. Translation and Composition

The revised text preserves many of the features of the original translation, but tends to read more smoothly and consistently. To take a fairly typical example, 1.16 begins by eliminating the initial *καί* then replaces *ἐποίησα* with *ἐποίουν*, which makes better sense in context and is consistent with the imperfects of the next verse. A few verses later, in 1.19, Sinaiticus reads *καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἷς τις τῶν ἐκ τῆς* Νινευὴ *καὶ ὑπέδειξεν* 'and one of those from Nineveh came and showed', which probably reflects the source text closely (judging by 4Q196); in G1 this becomes the much less clumsy *πορευθεὶς δὲ εἷς τῶν ἐν* Νινευὴ *ὑπέδειξεν*. The effect of such changes across the book is to create a version of Tobit which usually reads more fluently as

Greek, and in which there is less one-to-one correspondence with the Semitic source text of the original translation.

4. Key Text-critical Issues

The consistency of approach suggests that GI arose as the result of a specific editing of the text. It is important to be aware, however, both that it may have inherited some alterations to the original translation from its own source text, and that further changes may have become incorporated into the tradition after it first emerged. Even where we can identify the probable reading of the original translation, therefore, not every difference or correspondence can be laid at the door of GI's creator. The situation would be complicated considerably more were there persuasive evidence for any extensive interaction between the GI and GII traditions, but the two seem rarely to have co-existed, at least in Greek (GI readings are found in some Old Latin, apparently introduced as the result of revisions toward the Greek). It is interesting to note in 3.8, therefore, that the same pair of variants occurs in both GI and GII: *ὠνάσθης* (GII: MS 319, and reflected in the Old Latin; GI: Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, reflected in the daughter versions) and *ὠνομάσθης* (GII: Sinaiticus; GI: almost all other MSS). Some influence from one tradition to the other cannot be excluded here, although it may be easier to explain the more 'respectable' *ὠνομάσθης* as an independent, secondary development in each. By and large, though, we can treat GI and GII as distinct, which makes GI a useful corroborative witness to the original translation.

5. Ideology and Exegesis (GI and GII)

The numerous differences between the recensions of GI and GII have been listed by Hahnhart (*Text und Textgeschichte*, pp. 23–34). Most of these are of interest from text-critical and stylistic points of view, and a few examples of this have been mentioned above. One should therefore be cautious, without first considering style and textual variants, in assigning differences between the recensions to distinguishable ideologies. At the same time, a comparison between the versions does have the potential to yield insight into religious attitudes held or accentuated in the texts. Several examples of this illustrate the point. First, unlike GII the GI recension appears to have deliberately avoided the term *φάρμακον* as a designation for the fish's parts which, when applied in accordance with the angel's instructions, contribute to protection from the demon Asmodeus just before Tobias and Sara consummate their marriage and to the healing of Tobit's blindness. This difference illustrates how a much contested term (cf. the Greek to 2 Kgs 9.22; Jer. 34.9; Dan. 2.27; Mic. 5.11; Nah. 3.4; 1 En. 8.3; but cf. Sir. 38.1-15) could play a role in or even be subject to censure in the revision and transmission of the book (Stuckenbruck, 'Book of Tobit'). Second, in 3.6 both GI and GII relate Sara's decision not to commit suicide to her father's happiness. However, whereas GII stresses Sara's need to consider her father's public reputation (i.e. what people will say, ὀνειδιῶσιν) more than any moral implications of what she contemplates, GI considers the suicide shameful (ὄνειδος) in itself. Third, the place of Gentiles at the end of the book differs in GI and GII. At 14.4, GII has Tobit exhort his son to flee from Nineveh to Media because he believes the prophecy about Nineveh's destruction in Nahum (cf. 14.15). In GI, however, the warrant to flee Nineveh is found not in Nahum, but in a reference instead to Jonah. Since the story of Jonah, in contrast to the attitude of Nahum, results in the repentance of Nineveh, the reference to Jonah accords well with the text's anticipation in the following verses (14.6-7) that Gentiles will participate in the eschatological worship of God by Israel (though the tension with 14.15 remains; Bredin, 'Significance'). Fourth, it is possible that the original association of the verb λύω in 3.17 (MS 319, Sinaiticus) with a loosing or divorce of the demon Asmodeus from Sara (whom he loved, 6.15 MS 319 and GI) has been altered in GI to the more conventional verb 'to bind' (δέω) in line with Raphael's activity against the demon in 8.3. In a putative original (represented best in MS 319), Asmodeus' love for Sara is given marital overtones, and Raphael's act of 'binding' in 8.3 functions to ensure that the 'loosed' demon will not return. Sinaiticus retains the 'loosing', though this text no longer mentions Asmodeus' affection, thus losing the possible connotation of λυω within the larger narrative. While MS 319 regards the 'loosing' and 'binding' in 3.17 and 8.3, respectively, as different activities, the use of δέω in GI in both passages has the effect of losing the association between Raphael's activity against the demon and the demon's disposition towards Sara (Ego, 'Textual Variants').

The Third Version of Tobit (GIII)

1. General Characteristics

A small group of rather late Greek manuscripts (Hanhart's group *d*) preserves for the first few chapters of Tobit a text which is distinctive, but certainly belongs to the GI tradition. They then, however, present a very different text between about 6.8 and 13.2 (it is difficult to identify the precise beginning and end). The same text seems to underlie most manuscripts of the Syriac after about 7.11, and is clearly a different version of Tobit. In 6.8-12, where the two overlap, this version is very similar to the Old Latin text on Reginensis 7 (see above, GII § 1.c), and it is likely that the two are related in some way. If it is a reasonable assumption that this version of Tobit originally encompassed the whole book, then this Latin text may be the sole witness to the first part, although the Oxyrhynchus papyrus 1076, discussed above, is sometimes linked to the Third Greek—principally on the basis that it does not obviously belong to GI or GII.

GIII has often been characterized as a ‘mediating’ version, which draws on both the other two versions. Close examination suggests, however, that it is better understood as a separate re-working of the Greek translation, similar in nature to GI, but not dependent upon it (Weeks, ‘Neglected Texts’). Where the two agree against Sinaiticus, there is almost always a corresponding reading elsewhere among the witnesses to the Long Version, and where GIII is clearly altering its source, it rarely resembles GI. Indeed, there is little reason to believe that GIII shows any awareness at all of GI. It nevertheless operates in a similar way, re-writing and usually shortening its source text. 7.14 provides a brief but typical illustration. Here Sinaiticus is probably identical to the original translation, and reads *ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ἤρξαντο φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν* (= *πιεῖν*) ‘from then they began to eat and drink’: GI shortens this to *καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐσθίειν* ‘and they began to eat’; GIII quite differently to *καὶ τότε ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον* ‘and then they ate and drank’. Arguably, though, GIII is prepared to go rather further than GI in many cases, often quite substantially re-casting and re-phrasing the text. In 8.9-10, 18, for example, Raguel’s precautionary preparation of a grave for Tobias is narrated quite differently, with servants sent to dig, and then to fill it immediately upon their return, and Raguel’s motives given a somewhat sinister edge. In 11.3-6, similarly, the dog is given a much better role, running in front of Tobias so that it is the first thing Anna sees of her son’s return, and she has time to fetch Tobit. Whilst remaining reasonably faithful to its source, GIII tells a better story than either GI or GII, and it is hard to believe that this was not an intention of its creator. Such changes are reflected even in minor details—Anna stands to stare straight down the street in 11.05 (*εἱστήκει ἐπιβλέπουσα*), rather than sitting and looking around (*ἐκάθητο περιβλεπομένη*), as in the other versions. In 7.08, Edna and Sarah weep piously for Tobit in GI and GII, but according to GIII, Edna kisses Tobias, and so does Sarah—furnishing a motive for Tobias to ask Raphael, in the next verse, that he arrange for him to marry her, despite his previous reservations (and an added *δή* lends emphasis to the request!).

2. Time and Place of Composition

The principal manuscripts (Biblioteca Comunale, Ferrara, 187 I and 188 I, MSS 106 and 107 in the Göttingen scheme) are from the fourteenth century, and although the version is certainly much earlier, it is difficult to assign a date. A link with the Old Latin Reginensis text would take it back to the ninth century, but we cannot go further with certainty. Harris long ago suggested that GIII 12.8-9a was reflected in the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, written around the middle of the second century, but this is uncertain, and the specific formulation there might equally have been influenced by Sir 40.24. There is no evidence for location.

3. Translation and Composition

Minor changes of word-order and expression suggest that GIII is seeking to improve the fluency of its text, and different words are sometimes substituted. The resulting text is certainly more lucid and readable, but the style is not notably more literary than that of the original translation, and is less ambitious than that of GI.

4. Key Text-critical Issues

The fact that it revises the text so extensively does not prevent GIII being a useful corroborative witness to the original translation, and it sometimes offers the best Greek reading. Matters are made a little difficult, however, by the absence of a proper critical edition: readings from the relevant manuscripts are offered only in the apparatus of the major editions, and not always exhaustively, while only MS 106 is presented fully in the synoptic editions. Little work has been done on the relationship with the Syriac texts, moreover, and GIII is altogether a little neglected. It needs to be used with some caution, therefore, until such groundwork has been done.

5. Ideology and exegesis

It is difficult to identify any specific ideological interest, although GIII notably represents Asmodeus as an ‘evil spirit’ rather than a demon. That may reflect the ideas of its cultural context, but may also be just a biblicizing feature.

Bibliography

Auwers, J.-M., 'La tradition vieille latine du livre de Tobie. Un état de la question', in G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér (eds.), *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004* (JSJSup 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 1–21.

Bredin, M., 'The Significance of Jonah in Vaticanus (B) Tobit 14.4 and 8', in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit. A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark, 2006), pp. 43–58.

Cook, E.M., 'Our Translated Tobit', in K.J. Cathcart and M. Maher (eds.), *Targumic and Cognate Studies. Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOTSup 230; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp. 153–62.

Deselaers, P., *Das Buch Tobit. Studien zu seiner Enstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (OBO 43; Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

Ego, B., 'Textual Variants as the Result of Enculturation: The Banishment of the Demon in Tobit', in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 371–78.

Elgvin, T., and M. Hallermayer, 'Schøyen Ms. 5234: Ein neues Tobit-Fragment vom Toten Meer', *RevQ* 22 (2006), pp. 451–60.

Fitzmyer, J.A., 'Tobit', in M. Broshi et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 1–76, pls. I–X.

Gathercole, S., 'Tobit in Spain: Some Preliminary Comments on the Relationships between the Old Latin Witnesses', in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark, 2006), pp. 5–11.

Hallermayer, M., *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit* (Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 3; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

Hanhart, R., *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen MSU 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

Harris, J.R., 'The Double Text of Tobit', *AJT* 3 (1899), pp. 541–49.

Hanhart, R., *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Editum. Vol. VIII, 5 Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

Littmann, R.J., *Tobit: The Book of* Tobit *in Codex Sinaiticus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008).

Manfredi, M., 'Un Frammento del Libro di Tobit. LXX, Tobias, 12,6–7, 8–11,' *Paideia Cristiana. Studi in Onore di Mario Naldini* (Scritti in Onore 2; Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 1994), pp. 175–81.

Sabatier, P., *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ versiones Antiquæ, seu Vetus Italica, et Cæteræ quæcunque in Codicibus Mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quæ cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparantur: Accedunt Præfationes, Observationes, ac Notæ, Indexque novus ad VULGATAM è regione editam, idemque locupletissimus*, Volume 1 (Paris: F. Didot, re-issue 1751).

Nicklas, T. & C.J. Wagner, 'Thesen zur Textlichen Vielfalt im Tobitbuch', *JSJ* 34 (2003), pp. 141–59.

Stuckenbruck, L. 'The Book of Tobit and the Problem of "Magic"', in H. Lichtenberger and G. Oegema (eds.), *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antic-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), pp. 258–69.

Wagner, C.J., *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse. Griechisch – Lateinisch – Syrisch – Hebräisch – Aramäisch. Mit einem Index zu den Tobit-Fragmenten vom Toten Meer* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge, Band 258; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

Weeks, S., S. Gathercole, and L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit. Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions. With Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam Pertinentes 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

Weeks, S., 'Some Neglected Texts of Tobit: The Third Greek Version', in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit. A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark, 2006), pp. 12–42.

Weeks, S., 'Restoring the Greek Tobit', *JSJ* 44 (2013), pp. 1–15.